

REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein.

Claims 1-9 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 8 and 9 have been amended. Claims 1, 8 and 9 are independent claims.

Claim 3 is objected to for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter the applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner objects to the term "substantially higher" as the term "substantially" is not defined in the specification.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of claim 3 as applicant believes that the term substantially is adequately disclosed in the specification. However, claim 3 has been amended to remove the term substantially and, hence, now the blocking artefact density need only be higher than that of the neighboring row.

For the amendment made to the claim, applicant submits that the reason for the objection has been overcome and respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

The drawings are objected to because they fail to show appropriated contrast and distinct details in figures 3a and 3b.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for the rejection.

With regard to the subject matter shown in Figures 3a and 3b, applicant submits that these figures show grid rows including artefacts of type p1 and type p2 and the determination of indicator (IND) being incremented, decremented and remaining the same based on the row configuration of SG(t), RG(t-1) and RG(t).

Accordingly, applicant believes that subject matter shown in Figures 3a and 3b, in conjunction with the description of these figures in the written description, would be understood by those skilled in the arts.

For the remarks presented herein, applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC §101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter as claim 9 defines a computer program product but does not define a computer-readable medium or memory.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claim. However, claim 9 has been amended to further recite the computer program product stored in a programming memory. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 11, lines 25-30.

For the amendment made to claim 9, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome.

Claims 1-3, 6, 8, and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Martins (USP no. 6,438,275).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the reason for rejecting the claims. However, the independent claims have been amended to further recite that the determination of a current and previous reference grid is based on a row comparison. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 8, line 27-page 9, line 2.

Martins discloses a system for determining differences between a current frame, a previous frame and a previous/previous frame to determine whether changes in pixels have occurred among the referred to frames. Martins further discloses that pixels within a current frame may be classified as being stationary, moving, covered or uncovered. Stationary pixels are determined to be those pixels that have the same value among the current, previous and previous/previous frames, moving pixels are determined to those pixels that have a different value between a current and a previous frame or a previous frame and a previous/previous frame. Covered pixels are those pixels determined to have a same value between current and previous frames but non-equal values between previous and previous/previous frames. Uncovered pixels are those pixels determined to have a non-equal value between a current and previous frames and equal values between previous and previous/previous frames.

However, Martins fails to disclose a grid relationship among the current, previous and previous/previous frames, as is recited in each of the independent claims.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element recited therein is expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.

Martins cannot be said to anticipate the subject matter recited in the claims as Martins fails to expressly or inherently describe each and every element recited in the

independent claims.

For the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made above, applicant submits that the reason for the rejection of the independent claims has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

With regard to the remaining claims, each of these claims depends from one of the independent claims and, hence, is also allowable by virtue of its dependency upon an allowable base claim. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these dependent claims be withdrawn.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kutka (USP no. 7,173,968).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the claims.

Kutka discloses a system wherein an image with picture elements is allocated to a number of image segments. Kulka discloses the allocation process in Figures 1A-1E wherein an image B is divided into image blocks BB with interspaces between the blocks. The interspaces are interpolated by sequential image blocks.

Kutka, accordingly, discloses a system of utilizing blocks within **a same image** and fails to teach determining blocks that are temporally spaced (i.e., SG(t) and R(t-1)) as is recited in the claims.

Kutka cannot be said to anticipate the subject matter recited in claim 1, as Kutka fails to disclose each of the elements recited therein.

Applicant submits that the reason for the rejection has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martins in combination with Nio (USP no. 6,738,528).

With regard to the rejection of the aforementioned claims, applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the claims.

Each of the aforementioned claims depends from independent claim 1, which has been shown to include subject matter not disclosed by Martins. Nio fails to provide any teaching with regard to a temporal frame relationship (i.e., current frame and a preceding frame), as is recited in the claims.

A claim is not obvious over one or more prior art references if one or more prior art references, alone or in combination, do not teach all features of the claims or was generally known in the art.

In this case, the combination of Martins and Nio does not teach the elements recited in the independent claims and, consequently, the aforementioned dependent claims and, thus, does not render obvious the subject matter recited in the aforementioned dependent claims.

For at least the remarks above, applicant submits that the rejection of the dependent claims has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.


For the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein, applicant submits that all the objections and rejections have been overcome and that the

claims are in a condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Should the Examiner believe that the disposition of any issues arising from this response may be best resolved by a telephone call, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/4, 2008


By: Carl A. Giordano
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,780

Mail all correspondence to:
Daniel Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9608
Fax: (914) 332-0615

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document is being
☐ Transmitted by facsimile to 571 273 8300;
☐ Placed with the US Postal Service with First Class postage attached to the address indicated above;
on March _____ 2008.

Print Name

Signature